



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/927,412	08/13/2001	Mark Shannon	82001-0191	6383
24633	7590	07/22/2004	EXAMINER	
HOGAN & HARTSON LLP IP GROUP, COLUMBIA SQUARE 555 THIRTEENTH STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20004			BROSS, EDWARD J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2126	

DATE MAILED: 07/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/927,412	SHANNON ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Edward Bross	2126	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 October 2002.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-43 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1-43 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10-2-2002.
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-43 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-7, 10-16, 18-33 and 36-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beauchamp (6621,505) in view of Brichta et al. (5,884,310).

4. As to claims 1 and 30, Beauchamp discloses a system for integrating disparate applications (col. 4 lines 13-23), said system comprising an API server (214 Fig. 7) having an internal integrator (218 Fig. 7) and a B2B adapter (216 Fig. 7, col. 19 line 67 – col. 20 line 3).

5. Beauchamp does not disclose an ETL adapter.

6. Brichta discloses an ELT adapter (col. 3 lines 7-21).

7. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the ELT of Brichta in the system of Beauchamp in order to gain an increase in efficiency by converting all data from different sources into the same format.

8. As to claims 19 and 25, Beauchamp discloses a method for integrating disparate applications, the method comprising the steps of:
 - directly integrating the applications through an API ("Native API" Fig. 7);
9. Beauchamp does not disclose integrating the applications through a data adapter, said data adapter being an ETL adapter or a B2B adapter.
10. Brichta discloses integrating the applications through a data adapter, said data adapter being an ETL adapter (col. 3 lines 7-21).
11. As to claim 2, 20 and 26 Beauchamp and Brichta do not discloses said ETL adapter integrates applications within a firewall and said B2B adapter integrates applications separated by the firewall. However, firewalls and the use of a proxy method when crossing them are well known in the art.
12. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a firewall with the systems of Beauchamp and Brichta and allow applications within the firewall to communicate using the ETL adapter as this is more efficient and falling back to the B2B adapter when going separated by the firewall as this would still allow the two components to communicate.
13. As to claim 3, Beauchamp discloses said B2B adapter include business logic (col. 20 lines 6-10).
14. As to claim 4, Beauchamp discloses an application interface (col. 20 lines 3-6).

15. As to claims 23 and 28, Beauchamp discloses directly integrating the applications through a direct application interface (“Native API” Fig. 7).
16. As to claim 5, Beauchamp discloses said application interface is JAVA-based (col. 20 lines 3-6).
17. As to claims 6 and 32, Beauchamp discloses an XML gateway (250 Fig. 9).
18. As to claim 21, Beauchamp discloses integrating the applications over a distributed network (“Distributed Communication” Fig. 7).
19. As to claims 22 and 27, Beauchamp discloses integrating the applications over a distributed network further comprises the use of XML gateway (250 Fig. 9).
20. As to claims 7 and 33, Beauchamp discloses an application interface (col. 20 lines 3-6).
21. As to claims 10 and 36, Beauchamp discloses a rules and mapping agent (234 Fig. 8).
22. As to claims 11 and 37, Beauchamp does not explicitly disclose said rules and mapping agent is a JAVA application, however Java is the preferred embodiment of other components of

the system therefor it is reasonable to presume that the rules component is also a Java application..

23. As to claims 12 and 38, Beauchamp discloses a messaging agent (230 Fig. 8).

24. As to claims 13 and 39, Beauchamp discloses a process execution manager (202 Fig. 7)).

25. As to claims 14 and 40, Beauchamp discloses a security interface (the standard SecurityManager that is a part of the JAVA platform).

26. As to claims 15 and 41, Beauchamp does not discloses a log reporter. However, log reporters are well known in the art.

27. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a log reporter with the system of Beauchamp and Brichta in order to increase the maintainability and decrease trouble-shooting costs.

28. As to claims 16 and 42, Beauchamp discloses a data analyzer (238 Fig. 8).

29. As to claims 18, 24, 29 and 31, Beauchamp discloses said applications are business management applications (col. 19, lines 4-9).

Art Unit: 2126

30. Claims 8 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beauchamp (6621,505) in view of Brichta et al. (5,884,310) as applied to claims 1 and 30 above, and further in view of Cloud et al. (5,634,127).

31. As to claims 8 and 34, Beauchamp and Brichta do not disclose an application connectivity layer.

32. Cloud discloses an application connectivity layer (410 and 430 Fig. 4).

33. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the apparatus of Cloud in the system of Beauchamp and Brichta in order to increase the efficiency of the network by reducing the number of concurrent sessions required (abstract).

34. Claims 9 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beauchamp (6621,505) in view of Brichta et al. (5,884,310) as applied to claims 1 and 30 above, and further in view of Barnett et al. (6,356,948).

35. As to claims 9 and 35, Beauchamp and Brichta do not disclose a data normalizer.

36. Barnett discloses a data normalizer (50 Fig. 2).

37. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the apparatus of Barnett in the system of Beauchamp and Brichta in order to make it easier to process the incoming data by having it normalized into a standard configuration.

38. Claims 17 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beauchamp (6621,505) in view of Brichta et al. (5,884,310) as applied to claims 1 and 30 above, and further in view of Behm et al. (5,414,845).

39. As to claims 17 and 43, Beauchamp and Brichta do not disclose a services scheduler.

40. Behm discloses a services scheduler (col. 5 lines 27-29).

41. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the scheduler of Behm in the system of Beauchamp and Brichta in order to improve the performance by improving the scheduling.

42. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edward Bross whose telephone number is 703-305-8754. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on 703-305-9678. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2126

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

EB

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Snelas".